

An Analysis of Factors Explaining Personal Relationship Managers' (PRMs) Motivation: The Case of PT. XYZ, Tbk

Stephanie Sidarahardja, Santhio Ardy Susanto

International Business Management Program, Petra Christian University

Jl. Siwalankerto 121-131, Surabaya

E-mail: stephaniesidarhardja@gmail.com, santhioardysusanto@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

As much as employees important for an organization, motivation becomes the main concern of the employees management to determine the successful performance of the employees. This also happens in PT. XYZ in which the management has put some efforts to increase the motivation among the Personal Relationship Managers (PRMs) since based on the performance in 2013, only 30% among 236 were able to perform above the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) standards. For motivation becomes the biggest suspect of the low performance problem, the research attempted to identify the factors explaining motivation of PRMs working at PT. XYZ, Tbk. The research was carried out through exploratory factor analysis that gathered data from the distribution of questionnaires. Among 332 PRMs, 140 PRMs participated and became the samples. Finally, the research identified seven factors explaining the PRMs' motivation, which were (1) company's policies & culture, (2) superiors' attitudes, (3) job flexibility, (4) working condition, (5) job enrichment, (6) strategic clarity and (7) basic training programs.

Keywords: employee motivation, motivational factors, factor analysis, personal relationship manager

ABSTRAK

Mengingat pentingnya karyawan bagi sebuah organisasi, motivasi menjadi perhatian khusus bagi manajemen untuk meningkatkan kinerja dari karyawannya. Hal ini juga dapat ditemui di PT. XYZ, Tbk, dimana manajemen telah melakukan berbagai usaha untuk peningkatan motivasi Personal Relationship Manager (PRM) dikarenakan dari laporan kinerja PRM di tahun sebelumnya, hanya 30% dari 236 PRM yang berhasil memenuhi standar Key Performance Indicators (KPI) disebabkan rendahnya motivasi. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi faktor-faktor yang memengaruhi motivasi PRM di XYZ. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan menggunakan analisa faktor eksploratori dengan menggunakan data yang diperoleh dari hasil survei. Dari 332 PRM, terdapat 140 PRM yang berpartisipasi dan menjadi sampel. Dari analisa tersebut, ditemukan tujuh faktor yang menjelaskan motivasi PRM, yaitu (1) kebijakan dan budaya perusahaan, (2) sikap dari superior, (3) fleksibilitas pekerjaan, (4) kondisi pekerjaan, (5) pengayaan pekerjaan, (6) kejelasan strategi dan (7) program pelatihan dasar.

Kata Kunci: motivasi kerja karyawan, faktor motivasi, analisa faktor, personal relationship manager

INTRODUCTION

The source of an organization's growth relies much on the capability of the employees, meaning the performance of an organization will be determined by the performance of all employees within the organization. In all organizations, it is indisputable fact that human force has become the most valuable asset of an organization for they take parts in the process of transforming the strategy into action

(Hossain & Hossain, 2012). All organizations, through its human resource management, have put all of the energies and attentions to ensure they have highly performing employees to fulfill the duties and responsibilities. The concept of employees' performance is derived from the three key elements, which are ability, motivation and resources (Lussier, 2008). Unfortunately, recently, the management finds it difficult to manage the performance of employees due to the absence of motivation (Babu *et al.*, 1997).

In fact, keeping the employees motivated will increase the overall productivity and profitability of the organization (John *et al.*, 2012).

The same issue goes to PT. XYZ, Tbk., one of the well-known local banks in Indonesia. From years to years, XYZ has been maintaining its position in banking industry through the fund collection of its priority banking, ABC. Similar to other priority banking services, ABC is highly dependent on its Personal Relationship Managers (PRMs) who are responsible for acquiring new customers and maintaining existing customers. However, have all PRMs of ABC contributed to the performance of the organization? Surprisingly, by the end of December 2013, only 30% among 236 PRMs were able to perform above the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) standards. Then, this rise an issue for the majority of the company's funding collection is based on its priority banking where the PRMs are the backbones of the majority of the funding growth. Thus, the attention of the management on PRMs' low performance comes to be the basis of the research, in which it is believed that the research on PRMs' motivation is crucial for the increase of the PRMs' performance in several ways.

Low performance is significantly affected by low motivation. Among the elements of performance, low motivation is suspected to be the major influence on low performance because the PRMs have been equipped with the required abilities and necessary resources yet still showing low performance. Further, motivation has also been the concern to the management. Since the very first launch of the priority services, the management has put the biggest effort to invest in incentives programs. However, the investment of the incentive programs was only able to increase up to 3% of the PRM's performance from October 2012 – December 2013, whereas there should be a noticeable improvement in organizational performance when incentive plans are implemented (Bohlander & Snell, 2004). This shows that the current motivation programs are not strong enough to give significant results and there must be other motivational factors than incentives.

When motivation is corrected, performance is improved. Higher levels of motivation are likely associated with higher levels of performance (Mehta *et al.*, 2003). If the employees are motivated, they will see that the attainment of the goals is easier and the realization of the target is more possible. Moreover, motivated employees will see that the goals are worth to be achieved so they will give their efforts to perform the tasks (Koontz *et al.*, 2007). This also complements one of the previous research that say one of the outcomes of motivated employees is indeed high performance that contributes to the growth of the organization (Lai, 2009). Highly motivated PRMs will see that their target is achievable and show a significant improved performance that contributes to the growth of the bank. Therefore, through the understanding of factors explaining PRMs'

motivation, the management is able to increase the performance of PRMs, ABC can achieve the target growth and XYZ can maintain its position as one of the strongest banks in Indonesia.

It is based on this, the research wants to explore the motivational factors, so the management, not only implementing the successful programs based on general knowledge and experience, understands the real needs of PRMs and recreates the right motivation programs in accordance with the characteristics of PRMs. The knowledge of factors explaining PRMs' motivation, other than current factors, will help the management to adjust the motivation programs and improve the motivation significantly. This time, with the sufficient knowledge, good design and appropriate incentives, the management will be able to create successful programs (Hossain & Hossain, 2012).

LITERATURE REVIEW

There are several concepts and definitions in this research. Each of the concept and definition is selected in accordance with the objectives of the research. The concept of Personal Relationship Managers in ABC and employees' motivation justifies the scope of the research, need-based theory explains the needs that drive or motivate a person to behave in a certain way and Kovach's Ten-Job Reward Factors provide a guidance to construct the measurement variables (Kovach, 1987).

Personal Relationship Managers in ABC

Personal Relationship Managers (PRMs) are the most crucial marketing funding officers in ABC for these salespeople are dedicated to be the funding managers of ABC's customers. However, the most interesting thing is, while other priority banking services position their PRMs as the wealth managers, ABC differentiates their PRMs from others, sort of as the lifestyle managers. This is because ABC is not just an ordinary priority banking service that sell banking products and services, but they provide the customers with lifestyle benefits and privileges that others may not provide as indulgent as they do. Then, this put the PRMs as the ABC's brand ambassadors who should have a professional, positive and impressive image based on ABC's proposition. All of the PRMs are trained and equipped with necessary banking and lifestyle's knowledge, and therefore they have to be able to present and deliver all of them to the customers in hope they may acquire new customers or maintain existing customers.

Employees' Motivation

Motivation is derived from the Latin word "mover" that means, "to move". Theorists have studied motivation for years to know what makes human beings are interested in what they do and what kind of rewards get results. There are no absolute theories of motivation; all the theories keep growing and

complement each other to become the basis for the new theories development. Daft and Marcic (2004) define that motivation is the driving forces either within or outside a person that stimulates enthusiasm and persistence to pursue a certain action (p.444). Armstrong (2006) also defines that motivation is a goal-oriented behavior that leads to the actions of goals or rewards fulfillment. The main concept of motivation is both the internal and external forces that drive a person to be interested in doing something to fulfill certain needs or achieve specific goals. In fact, motivation becomes an issue and hard to manage because each individual has different needs and goals, and therefore, different individuals have different motivation (Kressler, 2003).

At work, motivation is the internal and external forces that drive employees to be interested in performing the job to fulfill certain needs or achieve specific goals. Managers are challenged to keep the employees motivated because what motivates one employee will not certainly motivate other employees in the same organization. There is no absolute motivation standard at work; the system that is successfully used in an organization will not definitely fit into other organizations. Managers must first understand the need and goal differences between employees in the organization in order to develop the motivation model that accommodates the employees and organization's objectives. This is why the motivation at work is defined as the willingness of employees to put more effort to achieve the organization's goals accompanied by the ability to satisfy individuals' needs (Robbins & Coulter, 1996). If the organization knows how to motivate the employees, they will gain competitive advantage over the competitors. The productivity and performance of organization will increase as motivation increases because motivation will result in employees' job satisfaction, commitment to organization, and desire to put the organization goals before their personal goals (Linz, Good, & Huddleston, 2006). Motivated employees will dedicate their time to do particular job with high level of commitment to achieve the goals of the organization. When managers understand what needs the employees are trying to satisfy and ensure the employees will be able to satisfy the needs when they perform at work, employees' motivation will no longer be the issue of an organization.

Need-Based Theory

As employees' motivation is defined as the forces that drive employees to perform the job in fulfillment of needs or goals. The need-based theory, including Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory, Alderfer's ERG Theory, McClelland's Manifest Needs Theory and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory.

Maslow (1943) has tried to explain the motivation through the urgency of all human beings to satisfy their needs. Maslow believed that human

beings have needs and those needs are hierarchically ranked. The Maslow's basic needs are as follows. Physiological are the most basic needs at work, representing the adequate salary, breaks and working conditions (Lussier, 2008, p. 324). When the physiological needs of individuals have been satisfied, they are seeking for higher level of needs, safety needs, such as job security (Lussier, 2008, p. 324) and retirement plans. Social needs come after the safety needs are met. At this point, individuals start to seek for the opportunity to work with others, to be accepted and to have friends (Lussier, 2008, p. 324). Then, satisfaction of esteem needs leads to social needs. These needs concern with individuals' ego and respect including position, involvement in decision-making, job satisfaction and job enrichment (Lussier, 2008, p. 324). Finally, the highest level of the needs hierarchy is the self-actualization needs. These needs concern with the individuals' full potential development, including the career promotion and development, job control and opportunities to express ideas (Lussier, 2008, p. 325).

Then, there is ERG Theory, one of the most well known modifications of Maslow's Hierarchy Needs Theory, developed by Alderfer (1969). Alderfer restructured the Maslow's hierarchy of needs from five categories into three categories of needs. Existence needs concern with the most basic needs of individuals, referring to Maslow's physiological and safety needs (Lussier, 2008, p. 325). Relatedness needs refer to relationship needs, similar to Maslow's social needs (Lussier, 2008, p. 325). Growth needs are the internal desire for personal development of individuals, corresponding with Maslow's esteem and self-actualization needs (Lussier, 2008, p. 325). However, there are some different underlying assumptions between Maslow's and Alderfer's Theory. For instance, the ERG theory does not believe the hierarchy of needs. Multiple needs may act as motivational factors at the same time when one need may appear to be more dominant than others and higher level of needs may be created before fulfilling the lower level of needs (Lai, 2009).

McClelland (1961) classifies there are three primary needs of individuals, which are achievement, power and affiliation needs. All individuals have these three needs in which one need tends to be dominant in each one of individuals. The individuals with high need for achievement tend to take personal responsibility to solve problems, seek for challenge, excellence and individuality, desire for a concrete feedback on their performance as well as working hard to complete the tasks or jobs. These individuals will perform well in dynamic, challenging and competitive situations (Lussier, 2008, p. 329). The individuals with high need for power tend to control situation, influence and control others or enjoy competition where they can win. These individuals seek for authority and status and neglect the needs for

affiliation (Lussier, 2008, p. 329). The individuals with high need for affiliation tend to seek for close relationship and want to be liked by others. These individuals focus on building relationship with others while avoiding supervision because they like to be accepted in the group (Lussier, 2008, p. 330).

Different from previous theories, Frederick Herzberg (1959) classifies the needs into two factors, called hygiene factors and motivational factors. The concept is that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are based on different attributes that are independent to each other (Habib *et al.*, 2010). The factors that satisfy employees at job are different from factors that dissatisfy them. Hygiene factors are usually called the extrinsic factors. These factors are related to work environment (Griffin, 2008), attempting to motivate individuals from the outside, such as pay, job security, job title, working condition, benefits and relationship (Trifunovska & Trifunovski, 2010). The inadequate of hygiene factors will cause dissatisfaction among employees, while the adequate of hygiene factors will no longer cause dissatisfaction or sometimes be taken for granted. Motivational factors are the intrinsic factors. These factors are related to work content (Griffin, 2008), attempting to motivate individuals from the job itself, such as achievement, recognition, challenge and advancement (Lussier, 2008, p. 327). The inadequate of motivational factors will have no impact among employees, while the adequate of motivational factors will cause satisfaction among employees and motivate them to work harder.

Kovach's Ten-Job Reward Factors

Kovach (1987) has also carried out studies to identify job-related factors that are considered important to motivate employees. In the studies, Kovach discovered there were ten factors that were essential to motivate employees, which are as follows. Full appreciation of work done is the form of recognition of employees that verifies the employees are doing well on the job (Jang, 2008). Feeling of being in on things describes the involvement and the engagement levels of employees in the current job (Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994). Sympathetic help with personal problems mean the superiors or the management provides time to counsel the employees when they are dealing with personal problems (Miller, 2014). Job security refers to the degree to which the employees feel secure in staying in the job for a period of time, without a threat of being unemployed or demoted (Ashford, Lee & Bobko, 1989). Good wages do not mean that the job gives the highest pay, but the job gives competitive pay (Emerson, 2004). Interesting work refers to the work that is challenging, has various duties and no routine (Jang, 2008). Addition to that, the job should involve personal interest and grow personal desire to do the job (Addario, 1995). Promotion and growth in organization is the advancement of career when

employees may have higher job level, higher salary and bigger responsibilities (Heathfield, 2014). Personal loyalty to employees talks about the roles of company or supervisors to develop the employees and meet their expectation (Graen & Scandura, 1986). Good working conditions can be indicated when the employees are treated with respect, the superiors support and build relationship with the employees and the employees are able to work in teams (NHCC, 2003). Last, tactful disciplines refer to the ability of supervisors to handle the mistakes of the employees that can be done through coaching and teaching model (Bowes, 2012). The reason why the factors are used as the fundamental basis of the variables development is because the factors are commonly used in motivational study across industries.

All in all, PRMs motivation is influenced by motivational factors that are developed based on Kovach's Ten Job Reward Factors. However, to have a better understanding on how the ten motivational factors may bring motivation to the PRMs is then through the assessment of the need-based theories. This is because motivational factors actually act as the instruments that drive or motivate the PRMs to perform the tasks well with the aim to fulfill their personal needs and goals. Therefore, it must be ensured that the factors will be the right instruments that help PRMs satisfy the needs when they are able to perform at high level and help the organization achieve its goals.

RESEARCH METHOD

As the purpose of the research is to identify the factors explaining PRMs' motivation, the research aims to explore the most possible motivational factors model for PRMs. There are no specific factor loadings that are tested in the research, the nature of the underlying variables is also not predicted, and therefore, there are no hypotheses in the research (Newsom, 2005). The research is carried out through exploratory study, specifically using exploratory factor analysis where there are no independent and dependent variables. The focus is to find the underlying common dimensions that are reflected in the observed variables, called factors. From the Kovach's Ten-Job Reward factors, 46 variables are extracted in which each factor has 3-5 variables extraction (Friendly, 1995).

The data are collected through questionnaires that covered administrative questions, such as name, NIP and phone number; classification questions, such as age, gender; and 46 investigative questions where the participants are asked to express their favorable or unfavourable attitudes towards the statement. The Likert scale is used where '1' has the least value and '5' has the highest value: the 'strongly disagree' is valued as '1', 'disagree' is valued as '2', 'neither agree nor disagree' is valued as '3', 'agree' is valued as '4' and 'strongly agree' is

valued as '5'. Then, the questionnaires are distributed to the majority of the PRMs via email using simple random sampling method that requires number of samples is at least $N > p \times 5$, given the p is 46 variables, and therefore the N should be greater than 230.

The analysis is done through IBM SPSS Statistics 21.0. The reliability test is done through split-half method. Spearman-Brown Split-Half method, as this method is able to correct inflation of the correlation index where the research contains many items (Cooper and Schindler, 2011). From the test, the one that should be focused on is the '*Spearman-Brown Coefficient – Equal Length*' that indicates the estimation of the reliability if both groups had equal or even numbers of items (Garson, 2009). The common rule is to have 0.80 or higher for having adequate reliability and 0.90 or higher for having good reliability (Garson, 2009). The validity test is done through different types of test. Concurrent validity is used to determine the possible factors, construct validity is used to build the instruments of the possible factors and content validity is used to judge the overall content. In this case, the judgment is determined by the researchers based on the definitions and concepts used. Then, descriptive analysis presents the distribution of the data using frequencies or percentages. There is no specific distribution that is tested, and therefore the data presents the actual profile of the respondents.

Before conducting the factor analysis, there are several tests should be conducted. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy is run to determine the adequacy of the number of sampling before running the factor analysis. This examines the partial correlation between variables (Field, 2013). The factor analysis can be conducted when the KMO value is high proven that the partial correlation is low. A KMO value greater than 0.50 is barely acceptable for runnign factor analysis (Kaiser, 1974 in Field 2013). Then, there is Bartlett's Test of Sphericity examining if there is a relationship between the variables by comparing the values in correlation matrix with the identity matrix. Small significance value of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p < 0.05$) is expected as it indicates that the factor analysis will be useful to process the variables because there is a significant relationship between variables (IBM SPSS Statistics Website, 2011). Anti-Image Test is usually done through the correlation matrix. This matrix actually contains the negatives of the partial correlations (Pek, 2008). In the matrix, the KMO value for each variable is shown in the diagonal of the matrix. The correlation coefficient in the diagonal is accepted when the value is equal or greater than 0.60, meaning the factors analysis can be conducted. If there is any variable with a value smaller than 0.50, the variable with the lowest value should be dropped until the overall values rises above 0.60 and finally the factors analysis can be run.

Finally, Factor Analysis is conducted to identify group of variables (Field, 2013). The aim of the factor

analysis is to understand the structure of the set variables, measure the underlying variables and reduce the data set into manageable size. Among the two types of factor analysis, exploratory factor analysis is chosen for EFA seeks to describe and summarize the data by clustering variables into factors. The variables may or may not have been chosen with potential underlying processes in mind. This usually used in the early stage of research where the urgency of the research is to consolidate variables and to generate hypotheses about the underlying processes. The steps of doing the factor analysis include the factor extraction, factor rotation and factor loading. The factor extraction is seen through the scree plot and eigenvalues method. The scree plot determines the number of factors through the point of inflexion where the slope changes dramatically (Field, 2013, adapted from Cattell, 1966), while the eigen values retains the factors that have eigenvalues greater than 1.00. The factor rotation is necessary for in the beginning; most high variables are generally loaded in the most important factors while low variables are loaded in other factors. Orthogonal rotation method is chosen to ensure the factors are independent and remaining uncorrelated to each other. Varimax, one of the famous orthogonal rotation methods, is used because this is a good general rotation approach to interpret factors (Field, 2013). The factor loading then is examined to ensure that all the variables are significantly loaded within the factors. The goal is to have the factor model that the variables are loaded significantly into the factors, there are no cross loading variables or there are no freestanding factor (Costello and Osborne, 2005).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

During the distribution of the questionnaires, the research is only able to gather 140 samples. However, the analysis is carried out because Simamora (2005) actually justifies that $N > 3 \times p$ are adequate to be processed through factor analysis. The results of the required analysis is as follows. The data were proven to be reliable for the Spearman-Brown Coefficient value was .933. This means that the data have a good reliability. Then, the data that are collected are valid. As this research is examining the factors explaining motivation among Personal Relationship Managers in XYZ, the research has already had concurrent validity because the researchers examine the possible factors explaining PRMs' motivation before conducting the research. In this case Kovach's Ten-Job Reward Factors are used to be the basis of the predictors development. Then, the research also has had the construct validity for each of the Kovach's factors is translated into observed variables based on the definition of each factor or the observation of previous research. This is why the content validity has justified the overall validity of the data from the valid measurement that

had been derived from the accepted theories and researches.

The demographic characteristics told that the majority of the respondents were female. Based on the category of age, the first category, 20-28 years old, amounts the biggest proportion of the respondents' age, which is 60%. This explains the effort of ABC in hiring fresh graduate students, within that age interval, through its salespeople management trainee program. This is why 64.3% of the respondents were single and 61.4% of the respondents have been working in XYZ for less than 1 year. 54.3% were under Jakarta region supervision because this is actually the biggest region in XYZ.

After that, the pre-test analysis is tested to see if the factors analysis is feasible for the available data. The KMO value was .886, which explains that the data are meritorious (Hutcheson and Sofroniou, 1999). The significance value of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was .000 showing that there is a strong relationship between variables that can be grouped into factors. The MSA values were all above .500, so there are no variables that should be dropped and the factors analysis could be conducted.

Finally, when the factors analysis was conducted, the required results are as follows. The factor extraction, using principal component method, examines that all the variables have communalities value greater than 0.50, which means all variables are adequately accounted for the factors solution. There are ten components that have eigenvalues greater than 1.00 that can explain 68.409% of the variations of the variables in the model. Then, the factor rotation is able to rotate the factors, given the significance loading of 0.50 for the number of sample is 140 (BMDP Statistical Software, Inc., 1993). The result shows that among the 10 factors of 46 variables, there are 11 low-loading variables and three freestanding factors. To deal with problematic issues, the researches decided to drop the problematic variables or factors and continue the research with 7 factors of 32 variables. It is found that there were seven factors explaining PRMs' motivation, which were company's policies & cultures, superiors' attitudes, job flexibility, working condition, job enrichment, strategic clarity and basic training programs.

The first factor is company's policies & culture. There company's policies are financial and non-financial, promotion & development and products & services policies. Financial and non-financial rewards are essential for PRMs because these are the basic reward of job that will help them to fulfill their basic needs and prevent work dissatisfaction among them. Further, as the majority of the respondents are Gen Y who are getting used to get rewards for the good behavior, they are looking for rewards for good performance at work (RHI, 2008; Deloitte, 2007; Rollsjö, 2008; Martin & Tulgan, 2001). Promotion and growth policies are also essential for they are

looking for opportunity growth at work because the majority of the PRMs are young and in the beginning of their career phase. Gen Y also believes that various opportunities of growth and development are important for their careers, both professional and non-professional (Deloitte 2007; RHI 2008; Rollsjö, 2008; Martin & Tulgan, 2001). When they feel like the company does not provide them with those career opportunities, they will not stay in the job. Products and services policies also become the motivational factors for they personally believe that when the products and services are good, they will be able to sell them easily and have better performance. Other than policies, the culture of the company that becomes the motivational factors, are the flexibility of working hour, security, appreciative, caring and supportive culture. The flexibility of working hour fulfills the mobility needs, as the majority of the respondents are coming from Jakarta where the distance between work and home may be quite far and the traffic may be unpredictable. Further, appreciation helps them to fulfill their needs on recognition for accomplishment, while caring and supportive culture helps them to feel like being accepted within the group. Then, when everyone has the appreciative, caring and supportive culture, they will feel secure and confident of staying in the job, they do not have to worry if they will be cut-off any time or there are new people replacing the job. This will help them focus on doing the job. Both policies and culture should understand the condition of the PRMs if they want to motivate them.

The second factor is the superiors' attitudes; in this case, the branch funding managers (BFMs) play very important roles to motivate the PRMs. The attitudes of superiors are talking about the willingness of the superiors to understand the PRMs and put some efforts to help them to pursue their dream career. As previously stated that the PRMs are looking for opportunities for growth, the superiors play roles as the mentors for their PRMs. The superiors are expected to have time for consultation where the PRMs may sit and share about their personal or work needs and problems and the superiors may understand the competencies and the capabilities of the PRMs. Then, the superiors may exploit their competencies to help them to solve the problems and even guide them to have a better career. The superiors' attitudes that reflect them as the mentors are essential for mentoring is important for Gen Y (RHI, 2008; Deloitte, 2007), especially when the mentoring helps them to have the career they want to have. Here, the mentoring here takes part for the learning and growth development because the mentor should be able to transfer the knowledge and guide the mentee. Thus, the superiors' attitudes should reflect the mentors' attitudes.

The third factor is the job flexibility. Job flexibility becomes the motivational factors for they need a job that provides them an opportunity to have a work-life balance, involve them in the decision-

making and have suitable management style with them. The work-life balance is essential for them as the majority of the respondents are young, they like flexibility of work. This is meaningful for them for the job that let them have a balance life where they can enjoy outside work activities will lead to a higher productivity at work (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). Further, the involvement in decision-making, otherwise, helps them feel needed by the company and shows that the company respect and recognize the potential. Specifically, Gen Y is impatient to give their aspiration in which they want to contribute their potential as early as they can (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). The suitable management style talks about the suitable job flexibility will help the comfortable in doing the job. For instance, as the majority of the PRMs are young people where they have high adaptability, they will be fine with the frequent changes in their job objectives. This is why how superiors and management design the job will determine the motivation of the PRMs.

The forth factor is the working condition. This working condition is the very basic factor that motivates the employees. The working condition where PRMs can enjoy working with the peers and the peers are confident and trust to each other will help the PRMs to stay in the job. This may happen for the majority of the respondents are young and they are getting used to working in teams at school. This is why more and more organization is considering for having teams structure in the organization because Gen Y likes to be working in teams at work (Palmer & Hardy, 2000).

The fifth factor is the job enrichment. The job enrichment emphasizes the enhancement of the work itself. PRMs feel motivated when the job enrichment reflect their personal interest, challenge them intellectually and offer opportunities for growth and development. This is talking that they will feel motivated when the job they are doing give them a chance to exploit their personal interest, in a good way, and exploit the capabilities. The high need of achievement drives them to aim for a challenging task to have the opportunities to show their abilities. Addition to that, job enrichment for Gen Y is considered important for they are looking for opportunities for growth and challenge (Kaye & Jordan Evans, 2002). Job enrichment may also help them to gain a new knowledge. Hence, they will feel motivated and have higher satisfaction when they are able to fulfill this kind of job.

The sixth factor is strategic clarity. The strategic clarity talks about the clarity in setting goals, objectives, target and strategies of the company that will be translated into the job requirements of PRMs. This is essential for PRMs wants to have a clear picture on what the company is doing in order to understand what they are required to do. Every job requirement is making sense when they understand

what the urgency behind it, so they do not only feel like they are doing the job for the incentives yet for the roles in the fulfillment of company's goal. Moreover, Gen Y wants to have jobs that are linked to an important goal (PrincetonOne, 2012). Like what it has stated before, they want to understand what they are doing and how their job can contribute to the company's goals.

The seventh factor is the basic training programs. The basic training programs include the hard skills and soft skills training for the PRMs. The hard skills training programs are usually the products knowledge, the selling skills training and any other training needed to perform the job. However, the soft skills training programs, such as team building activities, will help them to develop the soft skills. If the company brings frequent contests or new dynamics in the training, it will be essential to motivate them because their needs on having a better understanding or attaining new knowledge should be supported with some variations. This is because based on the Deloitte survey, Gen Y really appreciates training and when the company offers opportunity for training, it is a good way to retain and motivate employees (Tannenbaum, 2002).

CONCLUSION

The conclusion is that the management should pay attention on those seven factors explaining PRMs' motivation, which were company's policies & cultures, superiors' attitudes, job flexibility, working condition, job enrichment, strategic clarity and basic training programs. They have to put some efforts to accommodate those factors. From the analysis, it is found that the management should not only focus on the financial rewards but also on the non-financial rewards. The superiors' attitudes, promotion and development opportunities, job enrichment, working condition, trainings are also motivational factors for the PRMs. In addition, As the majority of the PRMs are young and falling under Gen Y, the characteristics of Gen Y is also important to help the management motivate the employees. This should be taken into account where Gen Y appreciates rewards, promotion and development, trainings and mentoring. These needs should be fulfilled through the motivational programs that the company has. In the end, they will be able to perform better and achieve the organization's goals.

The limitations of the research are the number of samples and the findings on the significance motivational factors. First, the research failed to gather the initial target of the minimum number of sample. The research was only able to gather 140 respondents out of the total population of 332 PRMs by the end of April 2014 because as the questionnaires were distributed via email, there were some difficulties with sending the email.. Second, the research was conducted through a quantitative study only, using factors analysis so the variables that were developed to measure the motivational factors of the

PRMs were based on the selected study, Kovach's Ten-Job Reward factors. Further, the exploratory factors analysis was only able to explore the motivational factors, but it could not see which factor was having the most significant factors towards PRMs' motivation.

The suggestions are to gather a greater number of samples and to conduct deeper analysis about the factors. It will be better if the research is able to collect greater number of samples because the factors model may improve (MacCallum, *et al.*, 2001). When there are trainings in head office or in regional office, the hard copy of questionnaires can be distributed to the PRMs with the help of the Sales Module Specialist. This way they can directly fill and return the questionnaires. Then, qualitative study exploring the seven motivational factors found in this research or other possible motivational factors may be conducted to understand the factors deeper. Another way is to do quantitative study using multiple regression analysis to examine the impact of the seven factors towards PRMs' motivation.

REFERENCES

- Addario, F. (1995). Employee Screening. *HHR Hospitality Human Resources*, 8(6).
- Alderfer, C. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior And Human Performance*, 4(2), 142-175.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice* (10th ed.). London: Kogan Page.
- Ashford, S., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, causes, and consequences of job insecurity: a theory-based measure and substantive test.
- Babu, A., Singh, Y., & Sachdeva, R. (1997). Managing Human Resources Within Extension. In B. Swanson, R. Bentz & A. Sofranko, *Improving Agricultural Extension. A Reference Manual* (1st ed.). Rome.
- Bankmega.com,. (2014). Welcome to Bank Mega. Retrieved 23 May 2014, from <http://www.bankmega.com>
- BMDP Statistical Software, Inc,. (1991). *SOLO Power Analysis* (1st ed.). Los Angeles: BMDP.
- Bohlander, G., & Snell, S. (2004). *Managing Human Resources* (13th ed.). Mason, Ohio: Thomson/South-Western.
- Bowes, B. (2012). Cashless Motivation: Best Strategies Target Issues Other Than Paycheque - Legacy Bowes Group Articles. *Legacybowes.com*. Retrieved 20 February 2014, from <http://www.legacybowes.com/latest-blog-posts/entry/cashless-motivation-best-strategies-target-issues-other-than-paycheque.html>
- Costello, A., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best Practices in Exploratory Factor Analysis: Four Recommendations for Getting the Most From Your Analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(7).
- Daft, R., & Marcic, D. (2004). *Understanding management* (1st ed.). Mason, Ohio: Thomson/South-Western.
- Dalflo, L., & Åström, L. (2013). *Case Study: The Relationship between Employee Motivation and Performance* (Bachelor). Umeå School of Business and Economics.
- Emerson, D. (2004). The Secret of Keeping Employees Happy... It's about the money, or is it?. Retrieved 8 February 2014, from <http://www.douglasemerson.com/news2-04.htm>
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Friendly, M. (1995). Planning a Factor Analytic study. *Psych.yorku.ca*. Retrieved 10 April 2014, from <http://www.psych.yorku.ca/lab/psy6140/fa/facplan.htm>
- Garson, D. (2009). Reliability Analysis: Statnotes, from North Carolina State University, Public Administration Program. *Tx.liberal.ntu.edu.tw*. Retrieved 8 April 2014, from <http://tx.liberal.ntu.edu.tw/~purplewoo/Literature/DataAnalysis/ReliabilityAnalysis.htm>
- Graen, G., Scandura, T., & Graen, M. (1986). A field experimental test of the moderating effects of growth need strength on productivity. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 484.
- Griffin, R. (2008). *Management* (1st ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Habib, M., Mukhtar, S., & Jamal, W. (2010). Why Would I Quit? Factors Influencing Teachers to Quit in Private Sector Higher Educational. *Institute Of Interdisciplinary Business Research*, 1(12).
- Heathfield, S. (2014). An HR Guide to Employee Promotions. *About.com Human Resources*. Retrieved 9 February 2014, from <http://humanresources.about.com/od/glossary/g/promotion.htm>
- Hershat, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective. *Journal Of Business And Psychology*, 25(2), 211-223.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. D., & Capwell, D. F. (1959). *The motivation to work* (1st ed.). New York: Wiley [u.a.].
- Hossain, M., & Hossain, A. (2012). Factors affecting employee's motivation in the fast food industry: The case of KFC UK Ltd. *Research Journal Of Economics, Business And ICT*, 5.
- Hutcheson, G., & Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist* (1st ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- IBM,. (2012). IBM Knowledge Center. *Www-01.ibm.com*. Retrieved 9 April 2014, from <http://www-01.ibm.com/support/knowledgecenter/#/SSLV>

- MB_21.0.0/com.ibm.spss.statistics.cs/fac_telco_kmo_01.htm
- Jang, J. (2008). *The Impact of Career Motivation and Polychronicity on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention among Hotel Industry Employees* (Master). University of North Texas.
- John, A., Gyamfuaa, K., Adwoa, N., Anita, K., & Agnes, A. (2012). Effects of Motivation on Employees Performance at First Allied Savings and Loans Limited, Adum Branch - Kumasi.
- Kaye, B., & Jordan-Evans, S. (2002). *Love'em or lose'em* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Koontz, H., & Weihrich, H. (2007). *Essentials of management* (1st ed.). New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Kovach, K. (1987). What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers. *Business Horizons*, 30(5), 58-65.
- Kressler, H. (2003). *Motivate and Reward: Performance Appraisal and Incentive Systems for Business Success* (1st ed.). Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lai, C. (2009). *Motivating Employees Through Incentive Programs* (Bachelor). Jyväskylä University of Applied Sciences.
- Linz, S., Good, L., & Huddleston, P. (2006). Worker morale in Russia: an exploratory study. *Journal Of Managerial Psychology*, 21(5), 415-437.
- Lussier, R. (2008). *Human relations in organizations* (7th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- MacCallum, R., Widaman, K., Preacher, K., & Hong, S. (2001). Sample size in factor analysis: The role of model error. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 36(4), 611-637
- Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370.
- McClelland, D. (1961). *The achieving society* (1st ed.). Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.
- Miller, A. (2014). How to Motivate Employees Who Are Having Personal Problems. Retrieved 9 February 2014, from <http://everydaylife.globalpost.com/motivate-employees-having-personal-problems-13237.html>
- Mehta, R., Dubinsky, A., & Anderson, R. (2003). Leadership style, motivation and performance in international marketing channels: An empirical investigation of the USA, Finland and Poland. *European Journal Of Marketing*, 37(1/2), 50-85.
- Newsom, (2005). *A Quick Primer on Exploratory Factor Analysis* (1st ed.). Retrieved from <http://web.cortland.edu/andersmd/psy341/efa.pdf>
- Nursing Home Community Coalition of New York State (NHCC). (2003). *What Makes for a Good Working Condition for Nursing Home Staff: What Do Direct Care Workers Have to Say?*
- Palmer, I., & Hardy, C. (2000). *Thinking about management* (1st ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Paullay, I., Alliger, G., & Stone-Romero, E. (1994). Construct validation of two instruments designed to measure job involvement and work centrality. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 79(2), 224.
- Pek, J. (2008). A Brief Introduction to SPSS Factor Analysis. *York University*. Retrieved 5 March 2014, from <http://www.yorku.ca>
- PrincetonOne. (2012). *Understanding Generation Y What You Need to Know About the Millennials* (1st ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.princetonone.com/news/PrincetonOneWhitePaper2.pdf>
- Robbins, S., & Coulter, M. (1996). *Management* (1st ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- RHI. (2008). *What Millenial Workers Want: How to Attract & Retain Gen Y Employees*. (1st ed.). Retrieved from http://www.accountingweb.com/sites/default/files/generationy_robert_half.pdf
- Rollsjö, A. (2008). *Attraction and Retention of Generation Y Employees* (Bachelor). Baltic Business School.
- Simamora, B. (2005). *Analisis Multivariat Pemasaran* (1st ed.). Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Tannenbaum, S. (2002). A strategic view of organization training and learning. In K. Kraiger, *Creating, Implementing, and Managing Effective Training and Development* (1st ed.). San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Trifunovska, K. (2010). *Human Resource Management; Motivation among employees in multinational corporations* (Bachelor). Kristianstad University.
- Tulgan, B., & Martin, C. (2001). *Managing Generation Y* (1st ed.). Amherst, Mass.: HRD Press.
- Westerman, J., & Yamamura, J. (2007). Generational preferences for work environment fit: effects on employee outcomes. *Career Development International*, 12(2), 150-161.